

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks and that Senator BURR also be able to complete his remarks before the vote starts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RURAL AMERICA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, there are a few, quote-unquote, winners under Democrats' \$3½ trillion tax-and-spending spree—unions, for example, and electric vehicle manufacturers.

But there are a lot more losers, like middle-class families, who have to stretch their paychecks to cover higher inflation and higher energy bills; workers, who will see jobs and opportunities shrink; and farmers and ranchers.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of my home State of South Dakota, and so ag issues are pretty much always on my mind. And I am deeply concerned by what Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will mean for South Dakota farmers.

For starters, I am worried that the Democrats' bill could mean the end of some farms, thanks to the bill's expansion of the death tax.

Now, I have long crusaded against the death tax. Death should not be a taxable event, and there should be limits on how many times the government can tax the same money over and over and over.

But I get particularly fired up when talking about the death tax when it comes to farmers and ranchers, because the death tax can threaten the existence of family farms and ranches.

You ask why.

Because farming and ranching are often cash-poor operations. Farmers' and ranchers' money is tied up in their land, not the bank. So a farmer could have land worth as much as several million dollars and still struggle to break even in years where the harvest has been poor.

So when that same farmer dies, the IRS will come in, demanding a substantial portion of his or her estate. But since most of that money is tied up in the land, there is a good chance that the family will not have enough money in the bank to pay the IRS, and so they will have to start selling off the land—the lifeblood of their farming operation.

So give that a couple of generations and the death tax can drive a family farm right out of existence.

I am proud that the tax reform bill we passed in 2017 included death tax relief. We successfully doubled the estate tax exemption, which lifted the specter of the death tax for most farmers and ranchers and helped reduce the need for costly estate planning efforts to try to keep the farm or ranch in the family.

Unfortunately—unfortunately—we were not able to make this relief permanent, which is why I have continued to push for eliminating the death tax. But at least family farms and ranches

were set to have relief through the year 2025.

Well, not anymore. Democrats are set to return the death tax exemption to its pre-2017 level starting in January, which means that more family farms and ranches will once again be in the tax's crosshairs.

As I said, death should not be a taxable event. The IRS should not be coming in to see you at the same time as the undertaker. But the government—and the government, I should say, should not be in the business of shuttering family farms and family businesses.

But thanks to Democrats' tax-and-spending spree, a lot of farmers are going to have to start worrying about whether they will be able to hand their farm on to their children or whether a government tax bill will mean the end of an enterprise the family has cultivated, literally, for generations.

The icing on the cake, of course, is that at the same time Democrats are planning to expand a tax that threatens family farms, they are also planning to include tax relief for their millionaire contributors in blue States.

That is right. Despite the fact that Democrats are scrambling for money to fund some of their spending spree, they are preparing to provide tax relief for wealthy Democrat donors.

I am disturbed by the fact that Democrats are willing to jeopardize family farms and ranches to help fund their spending spree. But I am not all that surprised because it is clear from the bill that farmers and ranchers are not high on Democrats' priority list.

The bill's spending on rail, for example, emphasizes passenger rail, which will benefit Amtrak and a handful of east coast cities, but it means little to most Americans.

The rail that matters to Americans in the heartland is freight rail, particularly short line railroads, which carry farmers' and ranchers' corn and wheat and beef to markets around the United States. But short line rail gets short shrift in this bill.

Biofuels also get short shrift. As this bill makes clear, Democrats have picked their preferred winner in the clean energy stakes, and that winner is electric vehicles. Biofuels take a back seat in Democrats' legislation despite the essential role they played in making American energy cleaner and despite the significance of biofuels to the rural economy.

Every few years, Congress passes a major farm bill. For decades, that legislation has been the product of bipartisan collaboration and a lengthy hearing and fact-finding process that allows for extensive input from farmers and ranchers and other ag stakeholders. It is one of the last, I would say, truly bipartisan things that we regularly do around here.

But Democrats have decided to use their tax-and-spending spree to circumvent the bipartisan farm bill process. Democrats are extending farm pro-

grams without bipartisan input and without real involvement from many in the agricultural community. And, of course, they are not expanding all farm bill programs.

They are not, for example, extending or providing money for the farm safety net. Instead, they are targeting money at programs that they feel will allow them to advance their climate agenda.

Farmers are not Democrats' main interest when it comes to the agricultural provisions in this bill. Democrats' climate agenda is the priority.

If I am not here in Washington for Senate business, I can usually be found back home in South Dakota, where I spend a lot of time talking to farmers and ranchers. Most of them haven't shown a lot of interest in tax breaks for union dues or electric vehicle tax credits. But I have heard from a lot of farmers and ranchers who are worried the Democrats' proposed tax policies may threaten their livelihood. And, unfortunately, they are right to be worried.

Speaker PELOSI suggested that this tax-and-spending spree was about Democrats' values, but based on what we have seen, I am not too sure those values align with those of rural Americans. Democrats' tax-and-spending spree is a bad deal for rural America and for working families around the country, and I will continue to do everything I can to protect Americans from the dangers of Democrats' socialist fantasies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO VANESSA J. LE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Vanessa Le, a dedicated member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence staff, an integral part of the committee's investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 U.S. elections, and my designee on the committee staff since March of 2019. While with the committee, Vanessa proved herself time and again to be more than just another capable lawyer. Although there is no debating her strengths as an attorney, it is—and I hope always will be—Vanessa's courage in the face of corruption and expedience that distinguishes her counsel. As an unrelenting advocate for virtue, sensibility, and the common good, Vanessa lives the axiom, "What is right is not always popular, and what is popular is not always right."

Vanessa's work for the committee covered a waterfront of complex national security challenges that ranged from investigating Russia's election interference to conducting oversight of the U.S. counterintelligence apparatus. As lead investigative counsel for the majority on the Russia investigation, Vanessa worked tirelessly to secure witness interviews and document production, draft and serve committee subpoenas, interview witnesses, and liaise with the Department of Justice,

the Office of Special Counsel, and the Senate legal counsel. In addition, she helped conduct witness interviews, drafted and reviewed chapters of the committee's report, and provided crucial legal advice on the committee's constitutional and Senate procedural authorities.

Vanessa was also responsible for overseeing the FBI and helping to actualize my policy objectives relative to the Bureau and the Nation's broader counterintelligence enterprise. Vanessa brought a keen mind, exacting questions, and a heartfelt passion for the role of the committee in keeping this Nation secure to work with her every day.

Vanessa's professional experience prior to joining the committee staff includes time as a litigation associate at the Drinker, Biddle & Reath law firm branch in Chicago, and as an Honors Attorney in the National Security Agency's Office of General Counsel. Vanessa is leaving the committee staff to work for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, where she will serve as a special advisor to the DNI. I can most assuredly say that our loss is Director Haines' gain. Vanessa will achieve incredible things at the ODNI, and it is to the country's benefit that her contributions to work with this intelligence community will continue. Although I am hopeful the transition will afford her more time with her husband Gary and son George and baby girl Margaux, anyone who has ever met Vanessa will tell you that she is not really the relax-at-home type. I suspect she will bring the same intensity and "let's get this done" attitude that she was known for on the committee into her role at the DNI.

Therefore, it is with a little reluctance and a lot of pride that I wish Vanessa well and thank her for all she has done for the committee. Her wit, intellect, boundless energy, and unparalleled mastery of the culinary arts will be impossible to replace.

Thank you, Vanessa. The vital investigative work of this committee would not have been accomplished absent your dedication, your clear-minded judgment, and your unwavering moral compass.

TRIBUTE TO NATE ADLER AND NICK BASCIANO

Mr. President, I would be remiss, though, to close my comments about Vanessa's departure from the committee without also acknowledging the departure of two other dedicated staff members. Nate Adler and Nick Basciano, currently serving on the majority staff of the committee, are leaving the committee to pursue the next chapters in their professional lives.

Nick and Nate have been valuable members of the committee staff, working critical portfolios covering, among other things, counterintelligence, foreign influence, and Asia, as well as serving as budget monitors to intelligence Agencies. Their contributions to the committee and its work cannot be overstated, and much cannot be pub-

licly acknowledged. Their dedication to mission and their work ethic was a model for all, and their presence and counsel will be sorely missed.

I wish them and Vanessa all the best in their future endeavors. I know that they are going to do great things, and I look forward to hearing and reading about those future accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 336, Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Maria Cantwell, Sheldon Whitehouse, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Angus S. King, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Paloma Adams-Allen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 404 Ex.]

#### YEAS—78

Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Barrasso	Heinrich	Romney
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Sanders
Booker	Inhofe	Sasse
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Burr	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Scott (SC)
Capito	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	Menendez	Thune
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Tillis
Cramer	Moran	Toomey
Crapo	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Fischer	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Peters	Wicker
Grassley	Portman	Wyden
Hagerty	Reed	Young

#### NAYS—21

Blackburn	Ernst	Lummis
Boozman	Hawley	Marshall
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Shelby
Daines	Lee	Tuberville

#### NOT VOTING—1

Feinstein

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lujan). On this vote, the yeas are 78 and the nays are 21.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator HAGERTY be able to complete our remarks prior to the scheduled recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOMINATION OF LAUREN J. KING

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nomination of Lauren King to serve as U.S. District Court judge for the Western District of Washington in the Seattle courthouse.

Ms. King is an immensely talented and experienced practitioner of the law, whom I had the honor of recommending to the President for this position, and I am proud to be advocating for her confirmation here today.

Ms. King currently chairs Foster Garvey's Native American Law Practice Group and has served as a pro tem appellate judge for the Northwest Intertribal Court System since 2013. She has served as a commissioner on the Washington State Gambling Commission and taught Federal Indian law at Seattle University School of Law.

Her qualifications are exemplary, and Ms. King's confirmation will also be a historic one. She is a citizen of the Muscogee Nation, and she would be the first-ever Native American Federal judge in the history of my home State of Washington.

Out of the 890 currently confirmed Federal judges, only 3 are Native American. Ms. King would become the fourth, and she would be the sixth-ever Native American judge in U.S. history.

While this number is still too low, Ms. King's confirmation will be an important step toward making sure the members of the Federal judiciary reflect the diversity of our Nation and have critical experience and insight into the unique relationship between our Federal Government and Native Tribes.

This is especially important in Washington State, which for those who don't know, is home to 29 federally recognized Indian Tribes.